[22nd October 1927

(c) No one was forced to compound. The individuals concerned admitted that it was stolen produce and they agreed to compound.

(d) Rs. 1,839.

(e) No cases were taken to court. In three cases the offence reports were sent to the Magistrate, but eventually the parties decided to pay the compounding fees

---

Appendix V.

[Vide answer to question No. 822 asked by Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 22nd October 1927, page 409 supra.]

32 Q.—Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the route from Muddavaram village in the Dhone taluk of the Kurnool district to Kolumulapalle and Sitarampuram is through the reserved forest;

(b) whether representations have been made to the Forest department, that in summer the cattle of Muddavaram must go to Kolumulapalle and Sitarampuram for water and that therefore the Forest department should disafforest sufficient extent to permit cattle to pass; and

(c) what action has been taken upon such representations?

A.—(a) The route from Muddavaram to Kolumulapalle passes through reserved forest. But it is a road of 30 feet width and is bordered by stone walls kept in good repair so that cattle may not leave the road and trespass into the forest.

The admitted route from Muddavaram to Sitarampuram does not pass through reserved forest but it is true that licensed cattle are permitted to take a short cut which does so pass. This is purely a concession and not a right.

(b) & (c) The Government understand that a representation was made to the District Forest Officer for disforestation but that no action was taken as enquiry elicited that there was ample room for cattle to pass, and that the proposals for disforestation emanated from certain individuals who wished to use the land so disforested for pasturing goats.

Appendix VI.

[Vide answer to question No. 823 asked by Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 22nd October 1927, page 409 supra.]

166 Q.—Mr G. Harisarvottama Rao: With reference to the answer to my question No. 358 answered on 17th March 1927, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

* * * *

(b) (ii) whether such half a mile distances have been marked;

22nd October 1927]

(b) (iii) how many cases of trespass in view of this rule have been discovered since the rule was made in all the forest divisions of Kurnool;

* * * *

(e) whether in the forest districts of Kurnool East, Kurnool South and Kurnool West reserve boundaries have been set back within the years 1925 and 1926, and if so, where and how far?

A.—(b) (ii) The half mile limits have not been marked as the heavy expenditure involved in cutting and maintaining the limits is not justified. The demarcation of the half mile limit is besides impracticable.

(b) (iii) No cases of trespass have come to light except one in Kurnool East division which is under investigation by the District Forest Officer.

(e) No reserve boundary was set back during 1925 and 1926.

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to question No. 831 asked by Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 22nd October 1927, page 414 supra.]

Copy of letter from the Executive Engineer, Kurnool division, to the Superintending Engineer, Madras Circle.

[Nandyal tank—Sluice No. 4—Legislative Council question No. 337.]

I submit herewith a report dealing with the points in the Legislative Council question No. 471 seriatim.

471 Q.—(a) The barrel of the sluice was badly leaky. No motor was visible in the joints of the masonry so far as could be seen from both ends. The barrel was too small to admit of examination from inside. The bund over the sluice had sunk and the earth slopes round the cistern had been washed out. These indicated that the safety of the structure could not be relied upon and at any time the tank bund might suddenly collapse. The bad condition of this sluice among other points was noticed by me in the course of my inspection of works in the closure of 1927. In the case of this tank which does not dry up every year, opportunity for thorough examination occurs only in bad years like the last one. Two notices of my inspection were given to the ryots through the Revenue department and the Irrigation Panchayat Board on 13th May 1927 and 21st May 1927 and I inspected the tank on 24th May 1927. Neither the Panchayat Board nor the ryots under the tank interested themselves in making any representations for improvements or bringing to notice any defects.

(b) The opening of the bund was started on 26th May 1927 but the unexpected rains in June 1927 retarded progress and the unusually heavy rains on 15th July 1927 suddenly filled up the tank in a day and the calingula began to surplus. Exposure and examination of the structure revealed that mere repairs would not do and the reconstruction was necessary.